The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOLUME XXIII — NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 2, 1920 — NUMBER 287

Contents

The Week 1
Editorials:
Production vs. Prices 4
After the Primaries 7
A Case of News Suppressed..... 8
Playing with Federal Control..... 8
General Articles:
Two Leading Democratic Candidates.....
.....Walter Lippmann and Charles Merz 10
American Graves in France...Elizabeth Hamm 14
Hillman and the Amalgamated...William Hard 15
The May King (Verse).....Mary Winsor 19
An Appeal from Russia..... 19
Correspondence 20
Reviews of Books:
Homage to Thomas Hardy....Samuel C. Chew 22
Unexplored New Guinea.....R. H. L. 26

The Week

IT was the irony of Carranza's death that even before he fell a victim to his own troops his enemies had ceased to care greatly whether he lived or died. He had no power left, and not the slightest chance, apparently, of appealing to his country. His enemies were already busy in his place. Superficially, at least, they are consolidating their gains. Governors of the different states are being appointed; trains run once more between Mexico City and Vera Cruz; telegraphic communication with the rest of the world is reopened. Are these the surface indications of an agreement between the factional leaders of the revolution? There is "harmony on all sides," asserts the Washington agent of the Provisional Government—and that is what some of the correspondents in Mexico City say. But the quarrel between Obregon and Gonzales is an old one. And there is always Villa, to say nothing of a dozen other ambitious men with armies, to be reckoned with. Another General may yet follow Carranza over the mountain ranges toward the sea.

CALLERS at the American State Department, since the setting up of a revolutionary government in Mexico City, have included Mr. Doheny of the Tampico oil industries, Mr. Walker of the Mexican Petroleum Company, Mr. Kelly of the Anaconda Copper, and various other representatives of American energy abroad. According to the New York Times they all urged "caution in extending recognition or support" to the new regime. "Definite assurances of the Mexican party now in power as to its attitude toward foreigners and foreign investments should be first obtained, it was held." Here is a chance, more than one American investor is thinking, to quash any disagreeable provisions in the Mexican constitution—simply by withholding recognition until the trick is done. Is it only an accident that we are now beginning to be told that (except for Obregon and Gonzales) all the new leaders in Mexico are dangerous men? "Radicals of the extreme type," says a dispatch to the Times from San Antonio, "many, judged by their past activities, being out-and-out Bolsheviki." It may yet be proposed that we fight Lenin by invading Mexico.

THERE is one clause in the army organization bill, now in the hands of a Senate committee, to which Mr. Gompers has drawn attention by his vigorous protest. This clause makes all men between 18 and 45 liable to "compulsory military service" whenever Congress shall declare and the President proclaim "that a national emergency exists." Mr. Gompers declares, "The term 'national emergency' can be and would be construed to cover any unusual condition that might exist within the borders of the country"—a strike, for instance. We agree with Mr. Gompers in his interpretation of the clause and in his fear of its consequences. Friends of the present bill say that nothing in the way of military strike-breaking is contemplated by its terms. Nevertheless, there remains one brief unemphasized section declaring that all men drafted "may be compelled under military regulations to engage in occupations of importance in the maintenance of the national interest during the emergency." What does that mean, if not drafting an army to break strikes? Nothing would have saved this country from widespread riot if a man like

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. Palmer had had this law as well as the Lever act to experiment with.

"IT was a foregone conclusion," commented Mr. Archibald Stevenson when some reporter informed him that Governor Smith had vetoed the Lusk bills —and the people of New York may bless their stars that one time in his life Mr. Stevenson was right. Into the discard goes a program of stupid and ill-tempered legislation: a bill to bar Socialists from holding public office, a bill to bar them from voting, a bill to set up a state bureau of espionage, another to put teachers in the hands of patrioteers, and one to keep the Rand School from teaching any sort of Socialism. On every point in his veto message Governor Smith stood on solid ground. He upheld "the fundamental right of the people to enjoy full liberty in the domain of idea and speech." He wins the gratitude of everyone save the professional hunters of heresy. To make the Governor's position impregnable, those citizens of the state who cherish democratic principle must work now to attempt the defeat of every legislator who took a hand in the coup d'état.

APPARENTLY, the Polish advance into Russia is slowing up. Soviet troops are counter-attacking, and north of Kiev have advanced thirty miles on a front fifty miles in length. It is a flank attack, in line with the strategy pursued by the Soviet command in its defense against Kolchak and Denikin. However, it is wise not to overestimate the military factor on either side of these offensives and counter-offensives. The Soviet advance may simply mean that on a front of fifty miles the Poles are pulling back a thin strung line of outposts numbering perhaps less than a thousand men. What is more important than this one withdrawal is the fact that in the past every substantial check of an anti-Soviet army has initiated its disintegration. The Kolchak army melted away at Samara, the Denikin army at Orel. If the Polish army is not continuously fed on easy successes it, too, may decide there is something better in life than fighting for its government's imperialism. Besides, there is always the threat of revolt by the people living in the conquered territory. Poland, in its advertised defense of western civilization, plans to manage territory in which the Poles will barely number one in three of the population.

FRANCE, of course, has played a major role in sending the Poles on their mission into Russia. How much have the other western nations helped? London dockers found that despite Mr. George's promise of no more intervention British munitions were being shipped to Poland. In the House of Commons Mr. Bonar Law had a ready explanation. These munitions, he said, were bought by Poland last October, and the government had just got around to delivering them. But the dockers have now refused to put such cargoes on shipboard, and the railway unions decline to handle them in transit. What of America's share in the venture? Writing in the London Herald Mr. H. N. Brailsford says, "Washington gives her [Poland] unlimited military stores on six years' credit." Mr. Brailsford is an accurate journalist, not in the practice of making irresponsible charges. We hope his present statement will interest some member of Congress enough to induce him to ask the State Department just what military stores we have contributed to Poland's march into Russian territory.

THE early successes of the Poles have been followed by reports of a crisis in Moscow. On Tuesday of last week the London Daily Telegraph had General Brusiloff displacing Lenin; and from Washington, five days later, a correspondent of the New York Times wired that "the collapse of the Bolshevist regime and the overthrow of the Lenin Soviet system are [once more] regarded as certain." This has been the tone of many recent dispatches. The only contradictory news, in fact, comes not from Washington and London but direct from Moscow. A dispatch to the London Daily News from the British labor delegation in Moscow reports that the Polish advance has unified the Russian nation. "The city people, peasants and army alike are unanimous in the determination to make any further sacrifices necessary to repel the new invader." Once more, perhaps, the Allied leaders who experiment with intervention may prove to the best friends of that regime they have worked industriously to destroy.

MORE than a thousand miles east of the line they are holding against the Poles the Russians are bringing troops across the Caspian Sea. They are reported to have driven the British out of Enzeli, a naval base on the Caspian to which the remnant of Denikin's fleet fled when Soviet troops marched into Baku. What the Russian government is striving for seems to be the opening of a route from Baku to the terminus of the Turkestan railroad. The Soviets have informed Persia that they are ready to annul the secret treaties negotiated under the old regime, to surrender the Tsar's concessions and to maintain the policy of non-interference. The Persian government, however, has protested to the League of Nations against Russian occupation of Enzeli. So long as they hold that port the Soviet

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bviously fail to put into practice their pronounced olicy of non-interference.

BRITISH protests against Russian occupation of Enzeli are as insistent as protests from Persia; and in this fact there is more than a little irony. For the British Foreign Office planned to pursue as a permanent policy just what it objects to Russia's doing even temporarily: it planned to make Enzeli a permanent British base. According to the New York World, such a concession was provided for in the treaty which England secretly negotiated with Persia after the armistice. Eight weeks ago Mr. Walter Hume Long, First Lord of the Admiralty, declared in an address in London: "We are on the threshold of tremendous opportunities and the nation must take care to occupy the house or others will take it, and with it the key to all future success. If we secure the supplies of oil now available in the world we can do what we like." Securing control of that oil is a quest upon which the British ruling class sets a high value. Russia, in Baku and Enzeli, blocks the road to one field of supply. As a result, British conferences with the Soviet delegates now in London may take a new turn: you withdraw from the Caspian, and—to save Russia from starvation—we'll raise the blockade.

TO the west of the Caspian lies the unhappy country of the Armenians. So far, it has been a country lacking even boundaries. Those boundaries Mr. Wilson, upon invitation of the Allies, has now agreed to draw. Where he would like to put them as disclosed in the State Department's note of arch 24th, commenting on the Turkish settlent: the boundaries "should be drawn in such a y as to recognize all the legitimate claims to the rmenian people and particularly to give them easy d unencumbered access to the sea." That, however, is an aim Mr. Wilson will now find difficult to alize. He will discover France in possession of e Armenian vilayet of Sivas and of Armenia's omised outlet on the Mediterranean; he will find ngland holding Armenia's gates to the Black Sea d the Caspian. In a spirited appeal Mr. Wilson ks Congress to undertake the protection of Arenia. But today that country needs more than otection. It needs to be made whole again.

N Ireland there is a situation that grows steadily orse and a panic-stricken government not knowing hat to do with it. Lord Birkenhead, in the House f Lords, asserts that more troops will be sent from ngland, and still more—and "if the existing mili-ry formations of this country are insufficient to e task that awaits them, we shall as little hesitate to go to the people of this country and ask an increase of those forces as we did in the crisis of the Great War." What is "the task" for which the Lord Chancellor is prepared to take such measures? Putting down rebellion in a country where rebellion has become a natural psychological substitute for self-government. The British government dallied with an explosive situation. Its Home Rule bill is already a failure—the Labor party, the Nationalists, and to some extent the Independent Liberals have withdrawn from its discussion. Meantime the government finds force a hopeless instrument for maintaining order.

THE rioting in Matewan, W. Va., which resulted in ten deaths was the fruit of many months of smouldering resentment. Matewan is a mining town in a non-union district near the Guyan Valley. What a vicious social and industrial order rules in that part of America was revealed some months ago when the New York World sent one of its reporters there. "The only law," said the World's investigator, "is the will of the Logan Coal Operators' Organization—and that law is enforced at the point of a rifle in the hands of men nominally known as deputy sheriffs but admittedly in the pay of the operators." It was this sort of situation that prepared the ground for the Matewan riots. A group of operatives employed by the Baldwin-Felts Detective Agency was apparently waiting on the platform of a railway station. Reports to the New York papers say that miners formerly employed by the Stone Mountain Coal Company opened fire on them. There was a running battle. Ten men were slain, seven of them detectives.

THE immediate source of trouble in Matewan seems to have been the eviction of miners from their homes. Three hundred families, according to the local secretary of the United Mine Workers, were on the companies' list for eviction because the head of the household had refused to renounce what the law guarantees him—his right to union membership. "Miners are being evicted without due process of law. One miner was held up with a Winchester while the roof was torn from his home. Cannot some action be taken by your Department?" That was the message sent from Matewan to Mr. Palmer on the 8th of May. He never answered it. Perhaps federal action might not have averted what has happened. But in the absence of federal action resentment increased against eviction without due process and against the assumption by private militia of powers belonging exclusively to the state. Eleven days later came the rioting.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BY another of those 5 to 4 decisions which are wearing away its prestige the Supreme Court has declared unconstitutional two compensation laws. One is an act of Congress, in 1917, giving the states power to enact compensation laws to protect workmen in maritime employment; the Court held that Congress alone has authority to legislate in respect to admiralty matters. The second decision declared unconstitutional, insofar as it relates to admiralty matters, the compensation act of New York State. The moral of the two decisions is plain. Seamen took a legitimate grievance to Congress; Congress referred them to the states; if the Supreme Court will not stand for state action, then Congress must itself enact a federal law guaranteeing adequate compensation to the maritime workmen.

Production vs. Prices

DURING the last weeks many retail stores throughout the country have succumbed to an unexpected fever for cutting prices. It is difficult from the haphazard reports in the daily papers to piece out a trustworthy estimate as to the distribution and the degree of the cutting, but it seems to have prevailed in most of the large cities; and it seems to have had small effect upon prices except in the case of wearing apparel. But whatever its scope it is producing a huge commotion in the business and domestic life of America. Probably the majority of Americans interpret it as the turn in the tide. For years they have watched with dismay the inexorable and apparently uncontrollable rise in the cost of living. For at least one year they have felt that the increase could not continue and have awaited with a mixture of apprehension and hope the long prophesied reaction in which prices were to come tumbling down and the consumer was once again to obtain the upper hand of the producer. There is a natural disposition to hope, if not to believe, that the lower prices for clothes are prophetic of lower prices for the other indispensable ingredients in the cost of living.

The event will not, we are afraid, realize these hopes and anticipations. We do not see any sufficient reason for expecting a sharp general or prolonged decline in prices. The group of economic conditions which have caused their steady and enormous increase not only remains unimpaired, but they are likely to work even more effectively and uncontrollably in the near future than they have in the past. The causes of the present limited decline are fugitive and occasional. It is not the result either of any substantial change in underlying conditions or of any intelligent and sufficiently radical attempt to submit prices to control. After ma months of connivance in speculation, the banks a finally bringing about a limited amount of liq dation by means of restricting credits, but manife ly as long as the major economic conditions a making for higher prices they cannot travel ver far along this route. It looks as if the prices o those necessities, such as food, shelter, heat an the like, which absorb the largest part of the e penditures of the average American, will rang higher next fall than they do today.

The comparative effects of the several cause which have contributed to bring about the cut i prices of wearing apparel are incalculable, but th process whereby the result was reached seems t be something as follows. The retailers had loade up with a heavy stock of spring and summer clothe particularly of the more expensive grades. Eithe because of the late spring or because of an increa ing disposition on the part of consumers not spend so much money on luxurious and unnecessar articles, they were unsuccessful in disposing of thei stocks. The retailers, like other business men, wer in an apprehensive and panicky state of mind. The were themselves reaping enormous profits, but thei situation was insecure. They were being condemne for profiteering. They had heard many prediction of the coming depression. They were afraid th the accusation of profiteering might damage the business. Perhaps by sacrificing something the might regain public confidence. Their margin c profit enabled them to carve a thick slice from th body of prices without actually losing money. Th more enterprising retailers started, consequently cut. Those who first drew blood were so success in attracting customers that their competitors l to follow suit. The practice became general. T newspapers seized upon it for exploitation, a under the influence of imitation and publicity it carried beyond the expectations and desires those who originated it. In fact, like so many ot matters which closely affect the popular welf American public opinion could not take up matter of price cutting without waxing hysteric

In one respect it may prophesy a change for better in the economics of current American p duction and consumption. For a long time American buyer has tamely submitted to almost increase in price which the retailer asked him pay. Now that he has learned his power, he m abandon hereafter his practice of non-resistan Possibly he will discriminate with more intelligen between luxuries and necessities and will not spe as much of his income as he has been spending excessively expensive articles which he or she c do without. The policy of the Federal Reser

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

oard will assist the buyer in making this dis-
mination. Apparently it will use its influence
th the banks to bring about a curtailment of
edit for trading in the less necessary items of
onsumption and an increase of credit for trading
n the commodities which people cannot do without.
The price of some grades of clothes and of other
goods which less well-to-do people can perfectly
well do without may settle down to a lower level.
Traders who have taken advantage of the ab-
ormal economic conditions to gather exorbitant
rofits may divine the danger of continuing to press
heir advantage and may voluntarily shave off
rices in the hope of allaying unrest.

But we doubt whether any tendency to lower
rices which may result from such voluntary action
y producers or consumers will counteract the effect
f those far more powerful and general causes
hich will make for a still further increase in the
ost of living. Consider how powerful those causes
re. The railroads are demanding an increase in
ates which they already place at about thirty per
ent and which, after the necessary wage-increases
re granted, may amount to fifty per cent. The
rice of those commodities which are transported
ill be increased by the whole of this expense and
more. Congress will probably pay in part for the
oldiers' bonus by a tax which will fall eventually
n consumption. In spite of the resentment which
he increase in rents has already provoked, the
embers of an average American family are
pending a smaller percentage of their income for
ousing than they did a few years ago. They will
ve to increase this percentage, for investors will
under existing conditions spend money on new
itations until rents are higher. Finally, food
es seem certain to increase. All reports agree
owing to the scarcity of labor the area planted
spring is smaller than last, and there is every
spect during the coming season of a substantial-
liminished production of food-stuffs in this coun-
without any corresponding prospect of a suffi-
ent increase elsewhere. In spite of all that
nomists have preached about the fatal effect of
oring industry at the expense of agriculture, the
ions still systematically pursue a protectionist
ustrial policy. They seem incapable either of
lizing or doing anything about the steady di-
ution taking place in the supply of food and raw
terials as compared to the demand for them.

Even apart, however, from the special difficulties
merated in the last paragraph, the most im-
tant of all the causes which make for higher
ces still remains in full force. The process of
lation has not been checked either in this country
abroad. Practically all European governments
are still borrowing or issuing paper money to the limit of their ability; and they are spending this paper for purposes which, except in unusual instances, do not increase their production of commodities or their future ability to satisfy their economic needs. These countries are suffering from a malady which has not before afflicted modern Europe. They are suffering from a fever of high prices, widespread speculation, large but precarious profits and yet at the same time low economic vitality and stagnant business. High prices and prodigious profiteering do little to stimulate production and, consequently, they are not curing themselves. They do not stimulate production partly because manufacturers cannot obtain raw materials, partly because the Treaty interferes with the old routes of commerce, and partly because the governments are lavishing on military preparations and doles money which is needed for industrial and social recuperation, and partly because of social unrest. Neither the capital nor the labor necessary to abundant production is forthcoming. The process of inflation which has gone on steadily since 1914 has, as Mr. Keynes has pointed out, operated to confiscate secretly and unobserved an important part of the wealth of the citizens of all modern states. "By this method," he says, "they not only confiscate but they confiscate arbitrarily; and while the process impoverishes many it actually enriches some. The sight of this rearrangement of riches strikes not only at the security but at the confidence in the equity of the existing distribution of wealth. . . . The process of wealth-getting degenerates into a gamble and a lottery. . . . It engages all the hidden forces of economic law on the side of destruction." Such being the case it is no wonder that high prices, reached as the result of inflation, fail to stimulate production.

Americans do not sufficiently recognize the extent to which their national economy also is suffering from the disease of inflationism, the extent to which "the hidden forces of economic law are engaged on the side of destruction." This country is relieved from many of the disabilities which interfere with European production. It has access to almost all the raw materials which its industry needs. It has no temptation to devote capital and labor which is required for purposes of economic and social recuperation to the task of supplying the wants of soldiers and civilians who cannot and do not work. Yet in our case, as in the case of Europe, high prices have not stimulated production, and it seems improbable that under existing conditions they will stimulate production. The industries and the people of the country cannot obtain many of the necessities of work and life except at prices

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which vitiate their value. Thousands of business men are reaping profits which a few years ago would have looked impossible. Yet the capital seeking investment is scarce. Labor also is scarce, and is not only scarce but actively and profoundly discontented. Production is curtailed for many apparently unnecessary reasons—because of outlaw and other strikes, because of the lack of cars and of congestion at freight terminals, because of uncertainty as to the political and economic future. In spite of the loud and frequent asserverations to that effect, the abuses, the evils and the dangers of the situation are not righting themselves. The machinery of production is badly damaged. An uncontrollably high cost of living is the symbol and result of that breakdown. The engineers and doctors of American business are doing nothing to repair it. They are disqualified from doing anything effective to repair it, because they will not admit the cause and the seriousness of the damage.

Since the armistice American business and government have proceeded on the theory that the national economy would recuperate easily and immediately from the effects of the war, provided only it was unshackled and allowed a free hand. In his message to Congress of December, 1918, President Wilson declared proudly that "our people do not wait to be coached and led. They know their own business, are quick and resourceful at every readjustment, definite in purpose, and self-reliant in action." "Therefore, the moment we knew the armistice was signed we took the harness off." "From no quarter," said the President, "have I seen any scheme of 'reconstruction' emerge which I thought it likely we could enforce our spirited business men and self-reliant laborers to accept with due pliancy and obedience." Congress was only too willing to accept the President's lead. The national executive and legislature entered into a competition with each other to purge business from the public control which they had reluctantly imposed during the war. The War Industries Board, the War Trade Board, the Food Administration and the Coal Administration were scrapped with all possible speed. The proposal to retain the railroads under national control for an experimental period of five years was treated with contempt by Congress and public opinion. It was assumed by everybody that if the spirited business man and the self-reliant laborer were licensed and encouraged to ignore public responsibilities and to allow their own interest to dictate their business conduct, they would furnish the American people with all the commodities they needed and all the "reconstruction."

Never was any assumption more utterly falsified by the event. As soon as the drivers removed th harness the horses started to run away. They ar still running. It is the business of a business ma to make profits, provided he can do so without r pudiating his contracts. Profits are the motiv power of unreconstructed industry. The opportunities of making profits were prodigious, but the profits were to be made not so much by increasing production as by manipulating prices. The alert and shrewd trader necessarily became a profiteer during a period of speculative business in which th cost of every unit of production was speculativ and when it was possible to mark up prices without any considerable stimulation of production and without any considerable discouragement of consumption. So the spirited business man who happened to occupy a favorable strategic economic situation proved his spirit by distributing to his fellow countrymen a moderate volume of produc at an immoderate price while the self-reliant laborer found his self-reliance of no use to him whatsoever If he followed the example of the spirited business man and took advantage of his own situation and the needs of the country he was accused of gross selfishness, even though his increased wages did not more than compensate him for the increased cost of living. When, as in the case of the railroad employees and coal miners, he proposed as an alternative or as a supplement to wage-increases a reorganization of the industry which would convert it into a public service and eliminate profiteering, his proposals were dismissed without discussion as an attempt to run American industry by soviets. He has become, consequently, more insubordinate than ever before in the history of the country and this insubordination is undoubtedly acting as a check production.

But it is only a more acute and peculiarly cos illustration of a general disorganization and t most dangerous aspect of the disorganization is i disquieting effect on the public mind. These hig prices which enrich the few and injure the mar which Congress and the Administration are helple to moderate or control, and which the regular pr cesses of business do not or will not cure, are sha ing popular confidence in the serviceability from t public point of view of the existing economic mec anism. While the high prices are not the resu merely of swollen profits, the swollen profits are not and will not, as they should, mend the hig prices. Under such conditions the condemnation profiteering is equivalent to a condemnation of th mechanism of production, which derives its moti power from profits. The only way to render th denunciation effective is to seek a reorganizatio of industry which will abandon profits as its sour

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

f energy and substitute for them a disinterested ɔoperative motive.

The insubordination is particularly acute among he railroad employees, who for a while were most ɔatient in urging their demands and most intelligent in trying to break out of the circle of high wages and high prices. The railroad system is almost as much disorganized as it was early in the war ınd is almost as much in need of public support. Its ɔreakdown alone is sufficiently serious to embarrass production. As a consequence of the failure of high prices to stimulate production, the prevalence of speculative profits and the growing discontent on the part of the wage-earners and salaried workers, of professional men and of families with fixed incomes, American business is confronted by a dangerous predicament. Its leaders are meeting the danger chiefly by exhorting labor to work, to save ınd to produce. But exhortation will not serve their purpose. They cannot impose the responsibility for rescuing capitalism from its peril upon the class which has reaped such a small part of the gains. At the present high level of prices, frugality for the great majority of wage earners means privation and want. They have small inducement to work long hours and with exceptional efficiency because they have no assurance that under existing inflational conditions increased production will not merely increase profits instead of lowering prices. The popular homilies in favor of thrift and work are themselves a clear indication of the break-down ɔf a profiteering industrial mechanism and of the need of substituting a public for a private motive in the conduct of business. The apologists for the existing economy have always praised it for its ⁻ıpposed ability to stimulate production without ⁻pending upon any but selfish motives. If these ɔtives are no longer effective in bringing about oduction, business leaders cannot make them ef- ctive by means of moral exhortation. These ex- ɔrtations are equivalent in the mouths of those ıo utter them to a confession of failure. As Mr. . H. Tawney says in his Sickness of an Acquisitive ɔciety, "Increased production was the one char- ɔteristic achievement of the age before the war, ; religion was of the Middle Ages or art of clas- ɔal Athens." But this increased production was ɔver distributed so as to allay discontent and now ıat productivity itself is compromised, society must ɔek its needed production by falling back on less elfish motives.

"Plenty depends upon cooperative effort and co- ɔeration upon moral principles" and moral prin- ples as applied to economic production are what he prophets of the old order have always con- idered themselves able to do without.

After the Primaries

NO Republican candidate has been selected at the primaries. The nominee will be selected in Chicago possibly at the convention, perhaps in a hotel room. In either event the Republican politicians are dealing with a different layout in June than they anticipated in January. The primary campaigns, in spite of their cost in money, energy, and time, have released political forces which were long repressed. The Republican managers have been warned, for they have had a taste of the real temper of the voters. No man and no issue may have emerged triumphant from the primaries, but notice has been given that the interior schism between progressive and standpat Republicans has not been obliterated, that the conditions which proceeded 1912 and 1916 still exist in the party. The blithe hopes of January that the country had gone back to the good old days before the Bull Moose,—those hopes are with the snows of yesteryear.

The first commandment of the convention is: satisfy those who voted for Johnson, or risk defeat in November. Behind that is a still greater warning addressed to both parties: it is that the headless eccentricity of the Democrats and the sterility of the Republican Congress have imperilled the American structure to such an extent that the usual tomfoolery of platforms and promises simply will not do. Nothing but the fatigue of the war, the immense but diminishing patience of the voters, and old habit, combined with Johnson's power of magnetizing progressives to the Republicans, have prevented a serious third party movement. Such a moven ıt may still arise, not that the country is ready for it, but because a minority has been exasperated by the hopelessness of the choice they are asked to make.

And yet, though the primaries have enormously complicated life for the politicians, the nation has gained by them. They have revived popular discussion and exploded a great mass of bogies inherited from the war. The Prussian idea and the red hysteria have both proved poor vote getters nineteen months after the armistice. This is proved above all by the campaign of General Wood, and the popular reception accorded Mr. Palmer whereever he has showed his head among the voters. Those who will take the trouble to study the evolution of General Wood's speeches in the last six months can see a gradual but sure deflation. Harsh certainties have given way to balanced sentences and weasel words. The General has met the voters and has been engaged in a strategic retreat ever since. The importance of this fact is not in its bearing upon the General but as evidence that there is

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a better atmosphere in politics. For politics have been ventilated for the first time in several years by the exercise of free discussion, free assemblage and the secret ballot. No one can say that the assumption of democratic traditions has produced miracles of constructive programs. But no one can deny that there is more vitality in American citizenship than there was six months ago. The arch of the repression is probably broken, and the restoration of the opportunities of free government on its way.

A Case of News Suppressed

DOES the great advertiser, with his power of controlling income, ever affect the news columns of the American press? Newspaper owners resent that charge. They ask for proof.

Not often is proof indisputable. The link between the advertiser and news editor is seldom clear. The great merchant does not tell the editor what he ought to think of foreign policy. Probably not once in a thousand times does he suggest that this or that interpretation be put upon rising prices or a steel strike. Nevertheless, there remains a norm by which most editors steer. There are exceptions—but most newspaper proprietors, we believe, are profoundly influenced by a desire not to acquire in the eyes of their large advertisers a reputation of being "unsafe" or "radical"—such a reputation as might be earned by displaying any really unorthodox news or opinions in such matters as Russia and rebel strikes and labor's guiltlessness of the major share in rising prices. Not active coercion, but unwillingness to run a risk considered unnecessary is the persuasive factor.

So runs the case ordinarily made by those who believe that in the field of American journalism he who pays the piper calls the tune. It is an effective case only when someone fits together a long series of isolated dispatches and sets them beside a history no longer in dispute. That sort of study is not often made. What happens, more often, is this:

There comes a suddenly illuminating incident which may involve only a narrow set of circumstances, but which must, in the eyes of many people, suggest implications in the whole field under editorial discretion. Such an incident, we think, occurred last week in Philadelphia.

On Tuesday, May 18th, according to a brief dispatch to the New York Times, United States Commissioner Manley issued warrants for the arrest of members of the firm of Gimbel Brothers, operators of the large department store of that name, charging them with violation of the Lever act. The warrants called for the arrest of Jac Gimbel, president; Ellis Gimbel, vice-presider Egbert Lough, secretary; Maurice Guggenhei treasurer; and E. L. Symser, manager of the fo department. Gimbel Brothers had charged u reasonable prices for sausage, tea and cocoa—s read the affidavit.

Now the subject of profiteering and the hig cost of living, is a "live" newspaper topic, if ar topic is; Gimbel Brothers is a firm with whic most of Philadelphia trades; and yet—

In the columns of the Philadelphia Publi Ledger and the Philadelphia North American o the morning after Commissioner Manley issue his warrant (that is the morning of May 19th) we find no mention of the fact that such a warran ever had been issued.

The Philadelphia papers are interested in pro iteering. In the North American, on the mornin of the 13th, you will read that warrant[illegible] sworn out, in New York, for the ar[illegible]oscur parties by the name of Max Muller a[illegible]ohn M Elroy and Mrs. Franzie de Silva. The Publi Ledger has published news of a similar sort.

These Philadelphia papers were intereste enough in profiteering to give their readers new of warrants issued, even when the offender was a obscure party, far from Philadelphia.

They were not interested in telling their reader that a federal warrant had been served upon th great firm of Gimbel Brothers, right in the hea of their own city.

What is the answer?

Playing with Federal Contrc

IT is becoming daily more apparent that the g ernment is meeting an unprecedented rail crisis with hopelessly inadequate weapons.

The condition of transportation paralysis toc is fully as bad as it was in the fall and winter 1917. Loaded freight cars are ranged in so blocks in the gateways and terminals, unable move; empties are standing idle on side-tracks; there are not enough cars to go around, and warehouses are full to bursting with goods aw ing shipment. Railway employees are deserting other more lucrative employments. The roads a under-equipped, under-manned, and financia starved. The result is that factories are laying their men, that the distribution of the necessar of life is gravely impeded, and that a terrific str is being put upon the whole banking and cre structure of the country.

Moreover, it is quite apparent that if left

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

eir own devices the railways will accomplish thing toward remedying the situation. They are t even attempting to formulate a labor policy hich will stop the wholesale desertion of railway nployees and restore the impaired morale and fficiency of railway labor. All responsibility for uch a policy has been shifted to the government. As to railway finance, the greater part of the railways of the country are admittedly helpless. So far s the operating problem is concerned, the experience of the war shows conclusively that self-help is futile. Traffic officials are loyal first of all to their own corporate employees, and in a system of competitive railroading that loyalty is as often s not in direct conflict with national traffic efficiency. Even under the emotional patriotism of the first few months of the war the railway officials proved incapable of subordinating their competitive impulses and suspicions to a cooperative system of car ervice. Much less can we expect them to do so oday, when the war harness has been shaken off.

It is not surprising, therefore, that the railway executives who three months ago were proclaiming he superior efficiency of unhampered private operation should today be clamoring at the doors of the Interstate Commerce Commission for a restoration of war control, for priority lists, and for compulory pooling of rolling stock. The press has taken he cue, and already we have dramatic pen-pictures of Commissioner Aitcheson, like a commanding general mobilizing the rolling stock of the country nd by heroic measures bringing order out of chaos.

The step was no doubt a wise one, and it may e assumed that the Commission is making the best se of the powers and personnel under its control. et when compared with the magnitude and difficulty of the task their efforts approach the grotque. To operate a competitive railway system a basis of national efficiency is no easy task. It ot enough to sit at a desk in Washington and mulate orders and resolutions. The main problm is the administrative one. It may be necessary, r instance, o divert a large block of freight cars om one line to another competing line. To give order for such a diversion is easy enough, but to rry it out through the medium of a reluctant and alcitrant traffic manager is a very different tter. Mr. McAdoo and Mr. Hines found the ly solution of the problem in a complete nationalation of the operating personnel. If a traffic manger disobeyed orders he could be fired. A large, ell organized department manned by trained railay men, with a staff in Washington and branch rganizations through the country was necessary to ake federal control of railway operation a reality. Today this organization is destroyed, its personnel dispersed throughout the country, its powers abrogated by the Esch-Cummins law. Instead we have an unwieldy and overburdened deliberative body, containing not a single trained railway executive, without a trace of an operating staff, with powers circumscribed by law and no means of enforcement except the slow and uncertain process of litigation. Instead of relying, as could Mr. Hines, on a network of subordinate railway officials throughout the United States, trained railway operators who could take responsibility and carry out orders, the Interstate Commerce Commission must rely both for information and execution of orders upon interested parties over whom they have no executive control. Their only disinterested source of information seems to be their widely heralded corps of a hundred boiler inspectors and safety appliance experts who were mobilized for the occasion. And their only means of enforcement are district attorneys and courts.

It must be apparent that with such an instrument but little can be accomplished. Without adequate powers and personnel, the Interstate Commerce Commission is merely playing with federal control. Its sonorous pronouncements and manifestoes signify nothing.

There is only one way out of this deadlock of paralysis and impotence. Real federal control must be restored, control by administrators rather than deliberators, executive control rather than quasi-judicial control. It is not too late to repair the wellnigh fatal error which Congress made when it disregarded the warning of the Railroad Administration and of the Brotherhoods and scrapped the machinery of federal control at precisely the time when the need for it was the greatest. Mr. Hines should again be conscripted and his powers restored.

The New
REPUBLIC
A Journal of Opinion

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1920, IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY THE REPUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, INC., 421 WEST TWENTY-FIRST STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y. HERBERT CROLY, PRESIDENT; ROBERT HALLOWELL, TREASURER

EDITORS

HERBERT CROLY CHARLES MERZ
FRANCIS HACKETT WALTER LIPPMANN
ALVIN JOHNSON PHILIP LITTELL
SIGNE TOKSVIG, Assistant Editor

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION FIFTY-TWO ISSUES, FIVE DOLLARS IN ADVANCE. SINGLE COPIES FIFTEEN CENTS. CANADIAN SUBSCRIPTION FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE. FOREIGN SUBSCRIPTIONS FOR COUNTRIES IN THE POSTAL UNION, SIX DOLLARS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE; REMITTANCE TO BE MADE BY INTERNATIONAL POSTAL MONEY ORDER.

ENTERED AS SECOND CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Two Leading Democratic Candidates

I. McAdoo

IF the Republicans do not nominate a man who can interest the people now voting for Johnson, and if the Democrats nominate McAdoo, it will be a hot summer for the Republican candidate; and about September fifteenth Mr. Will Hays will begin to sleep badly. For McAdoo is a little like Lloyd George. He knows not only what the owners of votes are thinking now, but what they will be excited about a few weeks from now. He has the political sense: he mobilized his war psychology before most people, and he demobilized it before the rest. He has the gift, which Roosevelt had and Wood lacks, of feeling with, but just ahead, of the mass of the voters, in short the gift of popular sympathy. He is possessed by what he feels, and men possessed in politics are infectious. Of all candidates he has incomparably the greatest sensibility to the prevailing winds of public opinion. Johnson, who is no mean politician himself, is by comparison immovable because more elemental; Wood is torpid and Lowden contracted and Hoover detached and deductive, but McAdoo is swift to note and swift to tack.

He picks his course quickly, moves fast upon it, and with great audacity. It may not be quite true, as one interviewer claims, that Secretary McAdoo made eight or nine important decisions one day going down in the elevator of a building in Washington, but it is somewhat in the direction of the truth. He is an agile man. He does not hesitate or brood or procrastinate or reflect at length. Instinctively he prefers the bold and the decisive to the prudent and tepid course, for he is a statesman grafted upon a promoter. The man described as the entrepreneur in the economic textbooks is, I think, the basic McAdoo, the kind of man who really likes enterprise more than profit, organizes ideas, and anticipates wants. That kind of man is first "sold" himself to an idea and then "sells" others. What he is determined to do he is passionately determined to do, once he falls into his stride. He said in 1915, when addressing the Chamber of Commerce of the United States at Washington in advocacy of the Shipping Bill:

> Since I have come to Washington there is one word in the English language with which I have become more familiar than any other, because it is the one word that is used most. I say that advisedly. I use it myself too much, and every time I use it I get ashamed of myself. You can talk to any man about anything and the first thing he says is, "I am afraid of so-and-so and so-and-so." He is afraid of something. Where is the courag of the American nation? Where is that virile powe that has made this American nation great? Has it dis appeared? I do not believe it. We are not afraid o anything, my friends, so long as we walk the path o rectitude and justice as a nation, and we intend to d that; and if this shipping bill passes all this talk abou getting into international difficulties is mere twaddle.

There are, I imagine, things of which McAdoo is afraid but they are not the usual spooks which terrify public officials. He is not afraid of responsibility, nor of dinner table gossip, nor of Congressional investigation, nor of private life, nor of the editorial writers, nor of experiment. Above all he is not afraid of words. He is remarkably free of the clatter made by rusty old tin can words like reactionary, radical, socialistic.

> I believe there is no intelligent banker, business man or citizen of this country, who understands the Federal Reserve system and its workings, who does not thank God for the great law which created that system, whether it be socialistic or whether it puts the government into the banking business or not. (October 13, 1915, before the Chamber of Commerce of Indianapolis.)

He had fought for that system and had helped to make it, he was for it, he was "sold," and he was prepared to thank God for it, and make a monkey of any one from Senator Root down who had opposed it. When McAdoo is under way he treats them rough, as almost any Republican candidate would quickly discover. He will not stand on ceremony. If he thinks miners are underpaid, if he knows that mine operators are overpaid, if he see the government muddling, he will not hesitate t call the public's attention to the statistics of prof which exist for public use in Senate document N 259, 65th Congress, 2nd Session.

In that famous instance he did no more th quote figures which over a year and a quarter h been public property, but he will not play an i sider's game as insiders play it. He has not t normal reticence and inhibitions of finance an politics. By experience as well as temperament h is an outsider who knows the inside wires. He disposed at critical moments to tell more than usually told, even at the risk of inconveniencing few people and of scandalizing many. McAdoo distinctly not a safe person in the ordinary use o the word. He is less safe than most devout pr gressives because he is so clever and so sophis ticated. He has a devilish knowledge of th tender spots, and a willingness to touch the occasionally.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What restrains him is not etiquette, nor the sentients of the best people, nor fear of novelty, nor ıe compulsions of routine and tradition. He is not rganized by a class feeling, nor by a set of proundly imbedded general principles. He is organzed by a remarkable sense of what a governing najority of voters wants and will receive. He is ıware of himself and of the political possibilities. He is bold to seize the possibilities, but prudent not o overstep them. He is not a gambler and not a anatic and not an evangelical reformer. He is a projector of concrete programs, and a promoter who can reveal to people that those programs embody what they already desire, and he is an administrator of the first order. McAdoo is a man who makes his way in the world, not by conformity ut by initiative, not by pull or regularity or even y genius, but by his wits. He is the kind of man who is self-made several times over. He is big at any rate in two dimensions. He has length and breadth if not depth.

The defects of his virtues are revealed rather clearly in the statement he issued some months ago about the finances of the government. There was a cry at that time to the effect that posterity should pay a larger portion of the costs of the war. The cry has served as General Wood's financial religion ever since, although on second thought people are beginning to think differently. McAdoo was caught by the gust.

> I think the present generation could with perfect propriety hand on to posterity the ultimate settlement of that part of our debt which remains unliquidated.

And therefore he proposed a highly ingenious scheme of funding and postponing, coupled with a plan to buy Jamaica, the Bahamas, Barbados, Nassau, British Honduras and the Bermudas with British obligations. In public office such a stunt would robably not emanate from McAdoo, for he has ıe faculty of surrounding himself with excellent en. The proposal was prestidigitated out of ivate life, but it illustrates one aspect of the free lay of his mind. It originated in a superficial public pinion of which he was acutely aware, and it was ertilized by a clever imagination. But it was not overned by sustained conviction about the enduring obligations and needs of a democratic people. t was facile and it was bold, but not calculated to roduce the profoundest confidence.

I have deliberately selected what seems to me he worst example I can find. It is probably not ypical, but it is an exaggerated symptom to be ıoted. Mr. McAdoo has been a truly distinguished ublic servant. When the smoke of manufactured pinion clears away, his administration of the railroads will probably be regarded as a piece of heroic and successful intervention in one of the worst crises of the war. There are not many who can estimate the work of any Secretary of the Treasury, and I am not one of them. But I have heard observers who were detached, had a chance to know, and knew how to know, rate McAdoo very high among Treasury officials. There is really no question of the practical competence of McAdoo. There is no more question of it than there is of Hoover's. Both are remarkable organizers and remarkable executives.

The doubt about McAdoo is really the obverse of the doubt about Hoover. Personally Hoover is extraordinarily fine and sensitive, but politically he has shown himself to be secluded and unaware. Lacking stimulation from the mass, he deduces opinions from a few stock ideas, in any political situation where his energy is not focussed by a specific task. McAdoo is less intricate personally, but infinitely more sensitive to the stimulus of popular feeling. When he misjudges that feeling, as of course he must occasionally, or when the important thing is not popular feeling but the governing ideas of a situation beyond the scope of immediate practical application, then McAdoo is likely to be quite conventional and rhetorical and flat, and to cater. His speeches on foreign affairs, especially in the early stages of the Treaty, are of this order. On the Fourth of July, 1919, for example, he was arguing for the Treaty: "Separate the League of Nations from the Treaty and it would be utterly impossible to enforce the Treaty . . ." That was the time, July 1919, when nobody had read the Treaty and everybody liked it because it was hard on the Huns. A year later Mr. McAdoo was saying something to the effect that God won the war but the devil won the peace. There had been the beginning of a radical change in public opinion. A beginning was enough. A hint is enough for McAdoo, but he needs the hint.

Thus in recent interviews he has been courageous and straightforward on contentious questions affecting civil liberty, Russia, the Palmer injunctions and the whole paraphernalia of the Red hysteria. He has talked the way free men are supposed to talk about these things. But he was not among the first to protest, because he is not fundamentally moved by the simple moralities. He is liberal but worldly, he is bold but immediate, he is brave but not selfless. He would win many skirmishes, and make brilliant dashes, and achieve some victories, but for the long strategic campaigning of democracy, it is hard to tell about him. It would all depend, I imagine, as indeed ultimately it always does, on the spirit and intelligence of the rank and file.

WALTER LIPPMANN.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

II. Cox

THERE are three good reasons why Governor Cox of Ohio may win his party's nomination. For one thing, he stands outside the shadow of the White House, no part of the official family, a man who has neither fought the President nor bled for him. Then, without having irreconcilably antagonized those who regard the Democratic party as a staunch defender of the status quo, he has caught the eye of those who look upon it as the country's most successful instrument of progress. Finally, among the avowed Democratic candidates north of Mason and Dixon's line, he is the one who stands best chance of carrying his own important state in the election. These are substantial factors. Conceivably, with a split in the Republican convention, or the nomination of a Republican candidate whose bourbonism no one questioned, they might even turn that long-celebrated Democratic rout into a bare but sufficient Democratic victory.

You need not give credence to this latter possibility, however, to appreciate the position of Cox as a contender for the nomination. Consider the geography of the election. The four states with the largest electoral votes are Illinois, Pennsylvania, New York and Ohio. No living Democrat can carry Illinois in 1920. Few Democrats living or dead have ever carried Pennsylvania. McAdoo might have an outside chance in New York. But at carrying his own state Cox has had greater experience.

He has carried it three times. No other Democratic Governor has ever done that in Ohio. On the last occasion, in 1918, like all other Democratic candidates he made his race with the President's appeal to the country hanging round his neck. Ohio went Republican. Both houses of the state legislature went Republican. Two-thirds of the Congressional districts went Republican. The entire state ticket, from Lieutenant-Governor down, went Republican. Cox was the single Democrat elected to state office. And Cox ran 75,000 votes ahead of the Congressional ticket.

He was helped, to be sure, by two factors that will not be at hand, in San Francisco, to help him win the nomination. One was the fact that his Republican opponent for the Governorship was a particularly pithless and unpopular candidate. Another was the fact that Cox was suspected of being a mild reservationist on prohibition. Perhaps that was an asset in an election in Ohio. At San Francisco, with Mr. Bryan ever ready to spring to arms overnight with a million men, a word for leniency in prohibition is probably something better left unsaid. Prohibition, however, and the feebleness of his opponent, cannot account for all o Cox's votes in 1918. Some of them, necessarily were won by virtue of his record in the state' affairs. So dark a horse has Cox been kept tha this record, and even the story of the man himself are little known today.

Cox, like most other past and present Presidential candidates, was born on a farm—a farm in southern Ohio—and educated in the public schools. Summer times, as a boy, he worked in a printer's office, interchangeably as printer's devil and reporter. He liked reporting better, and took to it as a career. He went to Cincinnati. For ten years he labored in the news rooms and editorial offices of the Cincinnati Enquirer. Then, like many young reporters who graduate out of newspaper work into banking or Persian rugs or politics, he became secretary to an Ohio Congressman. Four years later, coming back from Washington, he took advantage of a low market and with his savings bought the Dayton News. He was a good newspaperman, he still has a good eye for headlines, and he made the News a paying venture. In five years it had enabled him to go over into the neighboring city of Springfield and buy a second paper. That was in 1903. The political career opened six years later.

It has been a career of service in but two governmental offices. In 1909 Cox went to Congress, Representative of the Third Ohio District. In 1911 he went a second time. He did not set the Capitol afire. Few novices ever do. It is only after a Congressman has served six or seven terms, has outlived his elders on what few important committees there are, and has, unless he happen to be unusually perverse, acquired most of their bad habits and all of their reverence for unnecessar precedent, that he little by little moves into a posi tion where he can do his country either harm o good.

Cox fared no better and no worse than th average new member who comes into Congress anc goes down before the impact of the seniority rule He served two terms. He returned to Ohio. Anc a year later he was elected governor.

He made his campaign, that year, in support of a reform program, a program of amendments tc the state constitution. State courts still recognized the "fellow-servant rule," "contributory negligence" and similar rules regarding accidents in industry. Elimination of such medieval doctrine was one object contemplated by the constitutional amendments. There were many others. In fact, to put the amendments into practice, there were needed fifty-six separate legislative measures, cov-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ring a wide range of such matters as reorganization of the school and taxation systems of the state, a workmen's compensation law, provisions for a budget system, etc. It was a task requiring political skill of a considerable sort to get these various measures into shape, and to push them through a critical state legislature. Cox redeemed the promises of the campaign. He got his measures into law. In fact, he did the job so thoroughly that he met defeat when he came up for reelection. People have a way of being resentful, on occasion, when they find a new window in the house, even though they themselves have ordered it. Two years later Cox came back. He won in 1916. He won for a third time in 1918.

So much for a brief sketch of what has happened. On what front does Cox stand today?

The only information I have is based upon what messages, addresses, etc., the Governor's office supplied me, plus a talk of several hours with the Governor himself.

Regarding League and Treaty, my guess would be that Cox himself is not completely certain where he needs to draw the line. He has made a number of orthodox statements. His campaign managers declare him a loyal supporter of the President. I think the one most heartfelt thing that Cox has said about discussion of the League was when he said, "The public is sick and tired of it." Perhaps an accurate statement of his equipment and his point of view would read this way: He has never been a student of Europe and doesn't pretend to be, now; he recognizes that there are certain flagrant injustices in the Treaty; he thinks the League may remedy them; he wants disarmament. He lacks obviously and woefully Hoover's contact with the politics of Europe, McAdoo's contact with its finances. If he shares anything with Hoover and McAdoo, and with others of his fellow-aspirants, perhaps it is that wish to hurry peace now characteristic of all our statesmen save Mr. Wilson on one end and the irreconcilables on the other.

League and Treaty aside, in the field of domestic issues, three matters of representative importance are the railways, taxation and that vexatious question of how to handle Bolshevism and free speech. Cox, I think, would agree with the railway program of General Wood: (A) That efficient operation of the railways is imperative to the country's well-being; (B) Therefore the railways must be efficiently operated. This doesn't mean that Cox conceives the railway problem in terms no more complex than that, or that he hasn't given thought to it. He has. It simply means that Cox, like the other candidates, has proposed no definite and air-tight plan which is going to give the country that consolidated and non-competitive system it needs; the railways that credit they must have, and have without rates which shippers will consider exorbitant and without a permanent federal subsidy for which the public will not stand; and, finally, give the railway workers that responsibility and reward they will ask in return for willing and uninterrupted service.

As for taxation: Cox believes (a) that inheritance taxes should be left to the states; (b) that the excess profits tax raises costs and ought, therefore, to be done away with; and (c) that half of what would thus be lost can be made up by applying a tax of from 1 to 1½ per cent on the volume of business done by any concern.

In matters of civil liberty you strike a richer vein. From one of many similar passages I quote these four sentences:

> There is some hysteria over the subject of active elements in this country that are menacing to the government. There is no danger in the situation, although it might easily be aggravated if the governmental policy of restraint and common sense that has endured through the years were to become one of force and terrorism.... If government is assailed, its policy must not become vengeful. Our fathers, in specifying what human freedom was, and providing guarantees for its preservation, recognized that among the necessary precautions was the protection of individual right against governmental abuse.

Is this lip-service? The comment of a man who has observed that the best Mr. Mitchell Palmer's long-planned hysteria drive could do for him, in the Michigan primaries, was one vote in every forty-five?

Governor Cox has given a first-hand demonstration of the fact that he is not among those diplomatic statesmen who always believe in free speech in general but never in particular. He has shown a genuine faith in democratic tolerance. When the steel strike came, when peaceful meetings were prohibited in the steel towns of Pennsylvania, when mounted troopers rode down groups of men and women in the streets, when a General and his troops were called in to the city of Gary to break the morale of a strike that was fought for the basic right of recognition, in those days freedom of speech and freedom of assembly ruled undisturbed in every steel town of Ohio. It is a fact that union organizers, in the towns along the Pennsylvania-Ohio line, actually marched across the border to hold their meetings on the soil of a state whose governor still had faith in American tradition. Local public officials in Ohio were instructed to maintain order against rioting, but to interfere in no way with union meetings and union organization. And the result? Violence in Pennsylvania, men and wo-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

men hurt, fighting in the streets; in Ohio, not so much disorder as attends a trolley strike in New York City. In all six years of his administration Cox has never called out the state militia to police a strike. He has never had the need to.

I end on this note because, of the positive qualities in Governor Cox, this seems to me the dominant one. It represents him—fairly, I think—as a man with considerable courage and a good deal of self-possession. It shows, too, what is a key to Cox's mind in more ways than one: his education in Jeffersonian principles of government. More faith in those principles he has retained than most leaders of his party. That is why, when representatives of an ostensibly Jeffersonian administration like Palmer and Burleson have bludgeoned public opinion, and other representatives, like Wilson and Baker, have stood by in silence, Cox was willing to hold out against the alarmist press and the persuasive push of the steel companies. A surviving flare of Jeffersonian politics distinguishes him. In terms of politics his best performances are written —his state constitution, his defence of free speech, his quarrel with legal injustices. Economic problems, the perplexities of men and women adjusting themselves to an industrial civilization, find him less ready. He is a young man; swinging an old flail; but swinging it well. CHARLES MERZ.

American Graves in France

MEMORIAL DAY eighteen months after the armistice finds public sentiment in America turning more and more decidedly toward the permanent maintenance of the national cemeteries in France. Practical and sentimental considerations both counsel this course, and gold-star mothers and wives are almost universally ready to make one more sacrifice, resigning their right to dispose personally and individually of the bodies of their men. This is a very real sacrifice. In spite of reason to the contrary, there is comfort in the nearness of the graves of beloved dead. Little acts of homage and reverence at these dear shrines bring relief to grief-burdened hearts. Further than this, a woman's possessive feeling is deep-rooted in her mother instinct. Nevertheless, throughout the history of human progress women have been brave enough to give up the men they loved to death in a patriotic cause, and American women who proved themselves so valiant during the world war are ready now to accept the added trial of far separation from the graves of their fallen men.

A practical consideration of the details and difficulties of a general removal of our seventy-five thousand dead from the battlefields of France reveals the most cogent reasons why they should be left to sleep on untroubled. The gathering of the scattered dead into several large national cemeteries, a piece of work that was efficiently carried out a year ago by our Graves Registration Service was already dangerous and disagreeable. In spite of the sincere effort of the officers in command to maintain order and decency, gangs of workmen callous and accustomed to such grim work, sang and joked at their task, and rough-handled the coffins. The sensitive imagination shrinks from the thought of further indignities to these sacred bodies.

But the most compelling reason why we are willing to leave our soldiers in the soil redeemed by their blood springs from the beautiful, unshakable, fundamental sympathy of the great nation in whose breast they lie. If this did not exist, sure we should make every effort and surmount every difficulty to bring them home. A few misunderstandings were inevitable between individual members of our army and the French with whom they came in contact. One hears instances of tactlessness on either side, with its aftermath of irritation. Yet these little troubles lay on the surface, and are forgotten in France today. In their place burns in the great heart of our Ally undying gratitude for the American soldier.

This sentiment is so universal that any instance of it that is cited may be multiplied a thousand times. Before the small cemeteries were obliterated the graves were kept neat and trim and lovely with flowers. Wherever an American lay, his resting place became a garden of love. Many an American woman has been in touch with someone in France who has thus ministered to her boy's memory, and has received loving assurances of care, flowers plucked from his grave, and confidences regarding some dear lost poilu, who also gave his life for liberty. The sense of sisterhood is strong in the hearts of those who have exchanged such letters.

One cemetery on the banks of the Moselle River fully two miles from the nearest town, was visited once a week by the village priest and was beautifully cared for until the bodies buried there were removed to the National Cemetery at Thiaucourt. For this the old Curé refused to accept any compensation, and he so loved performing it that he would not resign the care to anyone else. Another American grave which chanced to be in the garden of a peasant home in Lorraine was made into a beautiful shrine. At the foot of the cross a heart was outlined with smooth white stones, and within this bloomed roses, pansies, and forget-me-nots. An old carved image of the Virgin stood among the flowers, and the daughter of the house pray-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

there each day for the soul of her lover who had fallen she knew not where, and for the American who had fallen at her door. The tender, watching figure of the Eternal Mother smiled compassionately upon the lad's quiet resting-place.

Now that practically every American soldier sleeps beneath his snow-white cross in well cared for American cemeteries, the love of the French people finds other outlet. An American woman who makes her pilgrimage to France finds assistance and sympathy everywhere. If she visits the town where her boy lodged, the entire population is interested in finding his billet. Town records are searched and photographs scanned. Recognition is sure to follow, and the room is located where once he lived and dreamed within sound of distant guns. Hospitality is offered, and tears stand in the eyes of the hostess, tears of love and understanding for the stranger within her gates. One wife tells how a young French woman recognized her from the photograph which her husband had exhibited with loving pride. This same peasant woman of Lorraine begged her guest to return the following night, "And I will arrange the room again exactly as he used it. See, there is the nail in the wall that he himself drove in for his mirror. He was so tall, and always smiling! Ah le cher brave enfant!" Who can measure the comfort to this wife of the night in the gay little room that he had described to her with humorous appreciation, down to the last detail of the rose-colored sofa with lace "draped over its dim facade?" His bright and inextinguishable spirit lived again for her in these his familiar surroundings, and she went her way enriched with a charming memory.

To the home-loving French people the fate of our young martyrs seemed doubly tragic, and again and again they say: "Yes, my son too was killed, but he died in his own land. How much more noble for yours to come and give his life so far away from home!" Their exile, their gayety, their beautiful tall bodies, their gift of friendliness, their very differences, and their splendid energy and indifference to death were a source of wonder and admiration to the French.

> He died
> And came with all his youth and unblown hopes
> On the world's heart, and touched it into tears.

In a land where such love and appreciation is poured out for them, our young men are no longer strangers. The great white fields of crosses lie under friendly skies, and the Stars and Stripes float above them gallantly and proudly. This is surely an honorable grave, just where he fell, breast forward, with his young faith undefeated and indestructible. Under his own beloved flag he sleeps by day, and by night, "girdled with gracious watching of the stars."

ELIZABETH HAMM.

Hillman and the Amalgamated

SIDNEY HILLMAN rose to open the first session of the convention of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America at Boston, and the convention rose to greet him in applause which carried the notes of a deep personal affection and of a deeper very impersonal mass-motion. Here was the loved leader of the population of a great industry, but here was also the responsive instrument of a thing which presently rose in the orchestra's selection of "The Hymn of Free Russia" and "The International."

He stood neat, trim, quiet, collected, agreeable, smiling, and very taut, and very quick—by appearance perhaps a highly successful young sales manager—by fact the manager, extremely successful, of the most proletarianly advanced trade-union in America.

He embodies two necessities: "the workers' world" and "business brains." I asked him once about the behavior of certain people in the men's clothing industry. "They are corrupt," he said. "When you are calm about them, you have to say that they are corrupt. When you get angry and let yourself loose about them, you have to say that they are inefficient."

At Boston Hillman was emphatic in saying that the convention should not give any orders to the General Executive Board of the union unless it was thoroughly sure that it wanted those orders actually executed. Views about the world in general were one thing. Orders to the General Executive Board were another. The Board would feel obliged to do its best to turn all orders into facts in the industry.

Two years ago the convention of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers enacted an order in the matter of the 44-hour week. At Boston this year the General Executive Board reported its efforts to achieve the 44-hour week and reported the 44-hour week to be now a fact in the industry.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Views and theory—orders and business—this union, I should say, has found its strength in never forgetting theory and in never abandoning business.

Five years ago it was a tiny affair—the product of a split in an American Federation of Labor union which itself was tiny in comparison with the population of the men's clothing industry. Hillman had been a cutter in the great shop of Hart, Schaffner and Marx in Chicago. A great strike had created a shop-agreement in that shop. Hillman had become the "fellow-worker" through whom—under that agreement—the workers in the Hart, Schaffner and Marx shop had the right to present their grievances. When—later—the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America came into existence, Hillman was elected its president. He became president of an "impossibility." Good friends of his in the American Federation of Labor told him that it was an impossibility.

The outcome, perhaps, throws some light on the value of a certain method and of a certain spirit.

The method of the Amalgamated seems to have grown directly out of such experiences as the Hart Schaffner and Marx agreement. It has been a method thinking always of "the shop." It differs from the method which thinks only of "the union."

If some skilled workers succeed in getting "union conditions" for themselves in a factory and are then willing to see their less skilled fellow-workers remain unorganized and the factory's problems of production remain unconsidered as long as their own stated receipts from the factory and from the industry are kept "unionized," they might well seem to be thinking only of "the union." The Hart Schaffner and Marx agreement obliged Hillman and his colleagues to think of all their fellow-workers and of all the problems of the shop as a shop.

The Amalgamated's method was thus from the very beginning a method really corresponding to the actual structure of the business. It could be called really a business method. It was quickened by a certain spirit—a certain theory—or, one might better say, by a certain view of a certain theory.

This theory—the theory of the ultimate management of industry by the representatives of all persons working in industry—is widely diffused throughout all trade-unionism. The leadership of the Amalgamated—its general officers—its General Executive Board took this radical theory in a progressive rather than a radical way. They took it very soberly.

Taken soberly, it implies the present toilsome organizing of all the workers in an industry and the present toilsome training of those workers—by experience—in industrial responsibility. Taken soberly, this radicalism is a continuous tentative advance in industrial efficiency. It is the alternative to sabotage. It is the alternative to "the deliberate withdrawal of efficiency" practiced today by multitudes of highly conservative wage-earners. It gives society, I should say, its coming choice: the growth of sabotage and a collapse of productivity or—with the recognition of the type of agreement produced by the Amalgamated Clothing Workers—a possible actual advance in productivity.

This method—this spirit—was certainly successful in the men's clothing industry as a method, and as a spirit, for getting members into a union. "Tailors cannot be organized." That was an axiom. The Amalgamated organized the tailors of the men's clothing industry of America virtually in mass—by 1919—and came to Boston in 1920 representing every variety of labor in The Industry, every race, every manufacturing market, every grade of product, every problem of the relationship between Labor and Capital, in the whole industry—and came rich. Out of a membership so lately sunk in sweatshops it came collectively rich and about to start a bank—a set of banks.

It had subscribed $100,000 in one check to the steel strike of 1919. The unions in that strike were all of them American Federation of Labor unions. But the Amalgamated—though outside the American Federation of Labor—was necessarily interested. The convention at Boston was interested.

It regarded the fight by the American Federation of Labor against Mr. Gary as a proletarian fight, and vigorously applauded the sending of that check to it. It regarded the fight of the New York Call against the price of white paper as a proletarian fight and appropriated several thousand dollars to it. It regarded the fight to get Mr. Debs out of jail and into the White House as a proletaria fight, and endorsed it. It regarded the fight b Russia's Red Army against Russia's invaders as proletarian fight, and cheered it. Then it voted i favor of making its members live up to standard of output in their weekly work in men's clothin factories.

This union was not afraid of incurring the risl of the epithet Bolshevik, but neither was it afrai of incurring the risk of collaboration with Capit in fixing standards of output—measurements work—requirements of productivity—in the mids of the capitalist system.

The debate on standards of output came on the convention's last day, on the afternoon of its las day, and it brought the delegates to their largest summary of the meaning of the Amalgamated and to their most important decision. It was preceded, however, by at least two other decisions of great

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mportance for the Amalgamated, and for the men's clothing industry, and for the American Labor Movement, and indirectly for all America.

The convention voted that there should be an Unemployment Fund in the men's clothing industry. The philosophy of this fund I gathered to be about as follows:

Unemployment is an industrial—not a political —incident. It is an incident of industrial management. The owners of the men's clothing industry hould create, and should maintain, an Unemployment Fund. The cost of it should be entirely on them. They may employ whatever number of men they may find necessary for producing the clothes demanded annually by the industry's customers. The workers will produce those clothes continuously if he owners can arrange continuity of production. Or they will produce them irregularly, as in the past, with few workers at work in slack seasons, and with many workers at work in busy seasons, and with a consequent excessive total of workers on the rolls of the industry annually, if the owners can arrange nothing better. But the Industry will be expected in any case—by employment—or by its Unemployment Fund—to provide a certain continuity of livelihood for the lives in it. Unemployment benefits must be paid by the owners.

In other words, the owners must penalize themselves for their own inefficiency of management. If hey want to escape the penalty, they must organize he industry for a continuous use of its machines nd of its men. They might diminish the number f machines. They might diminish the number of en. But whatever number of men they have to ave as men's clothing workers—that number they nust charge to the industry, while working and hile standing ready to work.

It is a principle not without a public interest. It clares unemployment to be a burden not of the te—not of the public treasury—not of the comnity in public benevolences or in private benevoces—but of each industry in proportion to its oduction of unemployment. It is a principle naal to a truly industrial union.

The convention sent it to the General Executive ard as an order.

The convention voted also that the General Extive Board should enter actively into the field cooperative business, the assumption being that first enterprise thus undertaken would be a nk.

The debate provoked by the prospect of a bank of credit societies and of buying-and-selling soties was quite intense. Certain delegates denced the cooperative movement as a "middless" movement. They dwelt on disagreements between Russian cooperative societies and Russian Soviets. They prophesied that the Amalgamated, if it went in for cooperative societies, would become "conservative." They thought—one might say—that Cooperation would be conduct unbecoming a really progressive proletarian organization.

In reply there was Alex Cohen of the General Executive Board who rather wanted to know if anybody present would give up trade-unionism because of there being trade-unions that had gone "conservative." Trade unions could be "conservative" or "radica '—as used. He pointed out a far from reactionary use for cooperative societies when he exclaimed:

"We need them to prove ourselves to those who criticize us. They do not think we are capable of managing anything. They will admit we can work. They do not admit we can manage. Through the cooperatives we will prove to them that we can work and manage both. We will prove to them that if they want to get out, the world would go on just the same."

Hillman spoke in reply, too. He spoke of The Revolution with the tartness of the realist.

He said that if the Amalgamated had discussed the 44-hour week from the standpoint of The Revolution, it would still be discussing it. He said that if the Amalgamated had waited to know whether short hours or long hours, high wages or low wages, would best promote The Revolution, it would still be in sweat-shops and not in a convention. He said that every time the Amalgamated won a raise of five dollars, the price of clothes went up not by five dollars but by much more than five dollars, out of the inefficiencies and wastes of the economic system surrounding it. He said that the project before the convention was not Cooperation in a book but Cooperation in the spirit of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America.

The motion directing the General Executive Board to proceed to initiate cooperative enterprises was carried by what seemed to be a heavy majority of voices, amid much clapping.

The choice of enterprises and the fixing of the details of the organizing of them seemed to be left to the Board. It is expected apparently that there will be a bank on a quite large scale with the backing of the national organization of the Amalgamated and that there will be cooperative credit Unions promoted by local branches of the Amalgamated and that there will be cooperative distributing institutions through which clothes made by members of the Amalgamated will be sold with more directness than at present to members of other Unions—such as certain Railway Unions.

There will be apparently an effort to di-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

channel of distribution direct from Union to Union. But the main channel and supporting central stream of the whole attempted system will be banking—credit—which would seem to indicate a realistic sense of existing economics.

These two matters, however—the Unemployment Fund and the entrance into Cooperation—were clearly in their nature an immediate material advantage to members of the Amalgamated, provided they were successful. The case was somewhat different when the convention addressed itself to the matter of standards of output. The fixing of standards of output might seem to be rather to the advantage of the employers.

The debate on it was correspondingly vehement. Even Hillman became vehement. For quite a while it seemed to me that the convention was about evenly divided in its applause for the contending speakers.

Certain delegates from New York were especially impassioned against standards. They denounced them as "slavery." They believed in work by the week with payment by the week for a week's work. Methods of imposing on the week-worker a graduated scale of performances and of wages seemed to them to be a vicious and disastrous revival of the old "slavery" of the task-system of the sweat-shops. That devastating and debilitating system they saw once more rising before them to end their new freedom. Their voices rose very high, and the applause that followed them seemed to show that they represented a view that was held very earnestly as well as widely on the convention floor.

Then spoke a member of the General Executive Board—Hyman Blumberg. He spoke of facts. With the utmost intensity of conviction he threw the facts of the system of standards in Baltimore at the arguments of the opponents of standards. The standards in Baltimore in the shop of the Sonneborn Company—a tremendously large shop—were Amalgamated standards. They were union standards. They were fixed by negotiation with the Union. These standards, I believe, put a worker into a certain grade of expected output per week and then give him the pay of that grade. He must deliver the output of his grade. The workers in the grade above him must deliver the output of their grade. The grading is done by classes of individual capacity. It seems to be a bit like handicapping in golf. It rests, however, on collective bargaining. The firm and the Union arrive at an agreed judgment as to the expected output of each grade and as to the assigning of individuals to that grade and as to the pay for that grade. This system—which I apprehended only in general out- Blumberg emphatically defended, and he demanded that the opponents of standards know that the workers in Sonneborn's had no apologies to offer for standards. They believed in standards.

Then Joseph Schlossberg spoke—the Amalgamated's General Secretary. He is the editor also of the Amalgamated's paper, The Advance. He is also, when he pleases, an orator. But he seems to be, above all, an organizer of ideas. He can state the philosophy of a project. He now opened up the philosophy of wages. He said that in every system of payment by the piece there was an element of time; because the calculation of the piece-rate was related to some assumption of an income to be earned in a week. He said that in every system of payment by the week there was an element of measurement of work; because the calculation of the week's wage was related to some assumption of the amount of output going into the market. His phrasing I did not take down, and I may be reporting some of it inaccurately; but his general argument was with regard to the relationship between all systems of payment, and his general contention was in favor of definiteness of knowledge about work—about the quantity of work done and to be done. He was for standards. He was powerfully for them.

Then finally came Hillman. He seemed to me to be more aroused than at any other time during the convention. His speech seemed to take a great many of the things that he had said during the convention and bring them back to recollection and to consideration, along with the things that he was now saying for the first time, in a total of feeling and policy. Very imperfectly I might try to repeat some of those things thus:

The inefficiencies and the wastes of production today give us a law of the jungle in industry. T is for the union to be an influence toward bringi in a reign of real law and order in industry. T industry must maintain and safeguard the worke The worker must maintain and safeguard the i dustry. We expect that Labor will come into i own in industry. We cannot wreck the house which we expect to live. We cannot wreck it ev if we want to wreck it. We cannot in the end defe the industry. By that route we can in the end o defeat ourselves. We have to rise now above t morale of the system about us. We have to be f production. The morale of business about us wou teach us to give as little as possible of our comm ty in return for as much as we can get. We mu rise above that morale. This decision which v are now about to make is a decision of the ve life of the Amalgamated and of its future. W have to be for the industry, for law and order the industry, for science in the industry. We ha

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to decide now whether the Amalgamated will be a progressive force in the industry, and grow, or be checked by its own act here.

He spoke with emotion and looked worn by it when he finished. The vote was called. The "ayes" and the "noes" seemed loudly balanced. Tellers were appointed. The "noes" then appeared to have louder per person than the "ayes." By count by tellers the "ayes" were in the majority by a great margin. The principle of standards for week-work had been adopted as a policy of the nion.

I thought that perhaps it had been a costly victory for Hillman. He had been very edged against the opponents of standards. He had cut at their most sensitive ideas very sharply. I really expected him to pay for his standards when the nominations for President of the Amalgamated for the next term of the presidency were opened.

A sudden mass of men stood on the floor. A mass of hands rose up, stretched out toward the platform. Everybody seemed to want to nominate somebody. Almost everybody did. There was one cry: "Hillman." WILLIAM HARD.

The May King

(Dedicated to A. Mitchell Palmer)

You must wake and call me early, call me early, mother dear.
Tomorrow 'ill be the happiest time of all the glad New Year;
Of all the glad New Year, mother, the maddest merriest day,
For I'm to be King of the May, mother, I'm to be King of the May.

sleep so sound all night, mother, that I shall never wake,
If you do not call me loud, when the bombs begin to break;
t I must gather squads of men and guns and bayonets gay,
For I'm to be King of the May, mother, for I'm to be King of the May.

I was hunting after Reds whom think ye I should see?
A Robin Redbreast on the bridge beneath the hazel tree.
e thought of that sharp look, mother, I gave him yesterday,
For I'm to be King of the May, mother, for I'm to be King of the May.

thought that I was after him and that's where he was right,
For everything looks red to me that isn't snowy-white.
ey call me cruel-hearted but I care not what they say,
For I'm to be King of the May, mother, for I'm to be King of the May.

hey say, all this is nonsense, but what is that to me?
They say, my power is breaking, but that can never be.
here's many a vote will come to me on next Election Day,
f I am King of the May, mother, if I am King of the May.

MARY WINSOR.

An Appeal from Russia

THE following appeal comes from the Union of Intellectual Workers in Russia, and is signed by a number of statesmen, editors, writers, etc., of whom Maxim Gorky is best known in this country. The appeal is specifically addressed to public opinion in America as well as in Europe. Yet we have seen its publication nowhere in the American press, and even no reference to it.

We reprint the appeal from the London Nation of May 1st. It needs no comment. It speaks clearly in its own behalf. The Nation publishes it with letters from Lord Haldane, H. G. Wells, L. P. Jacks, A. Lowes Dickinson, etc., all uniting in support of the policy it advocates.

The undersigned, members of the Russian Group of Intellectual Workers, and belonging to different shades of political and social opinion, after having witnessed the course of events in Russia during these latter years, have combined to apply our knowledge and our energies to restore the productive capacity of our country, and to preserve the little culture which has survived the world-war and the Revolution. We now appeal to the public opinion of Europe and America, and to our compatriots in exile, in order to point out to them the road it is necessary to follow so as to restore, as quickly as possible, the economic power of the people, and to bring about the resumption of economic relations between Russia and Western Europe. The Revolution, which has lasted for more than two years, has destroyed the foundations of the old regime, and is seeking fresh forms of political and social life, and these changes have inevitably been accompanied by excesses. This movement has reacted on the whole world, which, after this unexampled war, stands in need of peace and the means of culture indispensable to the establishment of a new organization in Russia. These are the reasons why, as it seems to us, the directing classes in other countries should aim at the reconstruction in Russia of a stable political and economic order.

While foreign help is indispensable in the economic sphere, and in that of Russian production, a question which affects the interests of the entire world, there is a danger in foreign, and particularly armed, intervention in the internal politics of a people of 150 millions. In this sphere the people itself, at the cost of suffering and conflict, must reorganize its new life; for, undoubtedly, methods of violence yield no positive result and are usually the source of new sufferings for a revolutionary nation, for they imperil the last remains of civilization.

Admitting this, it is still indispensable that our compatriots, who have been exiled from Russia for two years, should reconsider their beliefs and their opinions, which no longer correspond to the actual interests of the country, nor to the mentality and beliefs of the Russian masses, nor, in particular, to the views of those numerous groups of intellectuals whose opinions have been sensibly modified during the course of these latter months, in which days and hours seemed like years. One must, undoubtedly, strongly condemn the excesses which have taken place in Russia, but these negative facts, temporary as they are, must not separate Russian intellectuals from the Russian people, whose sufferings should be lightened by concessions and by personal sacrifices.

The political and economic state of Russia is clearly difficult. Russia stands in need of the creation of a new order, without which civilized life is impossible, and she needs economic reforms, and conditions favorable to the development of her energies.

It is impossible to foresee what direction the revolutionary process will take later on; what ideas will finally triumph, and what changes will take place

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

psychology of the people, and for that reason it is all the more difficult to influence these changes by means of violence.

The one salient point of the Russian question is as follows: it is impossible to go on isolating this gigantic country from the rest of the world till it has settled its economic and social problems. The interests of Russia, and of other countries, do not permit this, and the actual situation requires:—

1. That all armed intervention in the internal affairs of Russia should cease.

2. That business and intellectual relations with Russia should be resumed, irrespective of the existing regime.

3. That a process of free cooperation should be set up with the Russian people for the restoration of their economic, material, and intellectual forces.

Profoundly convinced that Russia will survive all her difficulties and will establish a new civilized life, we are persuaded that the leaders of public opinion in Europe will look with sympathy on our hopes, will respond to our appeal, and will assist the Russian people in their efforts to return to the path of peaceful labor.

(Signed) The Founders of the Union of Intellectual Workers.

V. Bekhtereff and C. Oldenbourg, Professors and Members of the Academy.

A. Zak, University Professor. V. Schavinsky, Professor.

Z. Kahn, V. Tarnovsky (ex-Director of the Siberian Bank). Zamberg, N. Zvileff (ex-Steamship and Mill-Owner). Siniaguine, A. Brafman (ex-Director of the Société de Crédit, Petrograd). Gelvatykh (ex-President of the Council of the Ural Mining Industry).

V. Plancon, E. Karatiguine, N. Ivanovsky, Margolis, A. Freze, and S. Dzenkonsky (lawyers, engineers, literary men, etc). P. Voronoff (ex-Staff General and Director of the Russian historical review "Rousskaia Starina"). N. Pantukoff, G. Chrzanovsky, B. Sabanine, Maxim Gorky, A. Babnovasky, S. Korff (ex-Senator), N. Elatchine (ex-Under-Secretary of State), N. Reinke, etc. (bureaucrats of the old regime).

CORRESPONDENCE

Johnson and the Indiana Vote

SIR: In the article Hiram Johnson—Problem, in your issue of May 19th, you say "Did votes from the other party help Johnson in Indiana as well as in California? Presumably they did."

The provisions of the Indiana primary election law are such that I do not believe Johnson received but very few Democratic votes. Under our statute a voter must declare the party with which he is affiliated and can then vote only for candidates on that party's ballot. Further he is subject to challenge on the ground that he is not a member of the party he declares for, and if so challenged will not be permitted to vote unless he makes affidavit that he did in fact vote at the last election for a majority of the candidates on that party's ticket, and intends to do so at the next election.

Johnson's votes were Republican votes.

Samuel B. Pettengill.

South Bend, Indiana.

European Publications

SIR: Owing to the depreciated currency of Europe and the financial difficulties in which many European nations find themselves, the publication of some European serials has been temporarily discontinued, others have decreased in size, while the publication of still others is irregular. Furthermore, the purchase of American books at the present rate of exchange is practically impossible.

Since it is essential for the intellectual life of mankind, that students of all countries should be in close touch, and since it seems of importance to America that the results of our intellectual activities should be known, the undersigned urge all publishers, publishing institutions and publishing societies to exchange their publications on the most liberal terms with libraries, publishers, journals and publishing institutions and societies of all European countries, disregarding for the near future the question whether the amount of printed matter received in exchange corresponds with the amount sent.

Felix Adler,	George Foster Peabody,
James R. Angell,	M. L. Pupin,
Franz Boas,	Jacob Gould Schurman,
Charles W. Eliot,	Ellery Sedgwick,
J. Cardinal Gibbons,	F. J. V. Skiff,
Arthur T. Hadley,	Munroe Smith,
David Starr Jordan,	Dr. Antonio Stella,
Harry Pratt Judson,	Harlan F. Stone,
Dr. E. H. Lewinski-Corwin,	Henry Suzzallo,
A. Lawrence Lowell,	William H. Taft,
John Bassett Moore,	F. A. Vanderlip.

Henry Fairfield Osborn,

A Congressional Pleasure Trip

SIR: Several weeks ago the newspapers announced that there would be an expedition this summer of members of Congress and their wives (and families?) to Hawaii, the Philippines, Japan, and China, for the purpose of "gathering information at first hand," and that a government transport had been detailed to carry them. No statement was made as to the kind of information to be sought, the competency of these gentleme even when accompanied by ladies, to obtain it, the sup riority of information so obtained to that furnished experts, or the contribution it would make to the wi and economical government of this country.

Since the first announcement of the junket the pape have been silent in regard to it. Is it that not even Congressman desirous of seeing the world and showin it to his wife at his country's expense could seriousl contemplate such a scheme, and that the story was t humorous invention of some mischievous reporter w planned to bring odium upon the mighty? Or is it th the papers have received directions to say nothing of t matter, lest the expedition should be overwhelmed b public denunciation?

If such a raid on the treasury is actually under wa at a time when every one acknowledges that rigid ecor omy is the only salvation for the country, would it no be well to secure the name of each Congressman wh takes part in it and publish them? Such unblushing gra should unquestionably mark every participant for defe at the next election.

Frederick Palmer.

Cambridge, Massachusetts.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED